

Remarks

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 21-26 and 28-29 are pending in this Application upon entry of this Amendment. In the Office Action dated June 21, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-17, 20-26, and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. In addition, the Examiner rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) claims 1-7, 20-26, and 30-31 over Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter APA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,778,787 to Cannon (hereinafter Cannon) and U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0008928 to TAKAHASHI (hereinafter TAKAHASHI), claims 11, 13-15, and 20 over U.S. Patent No. 6,519,715 to Takashi et al. (hereinafter Takashi) in view of Cannon, APA, TAKAHASHI, and U.S. Patent No. 6,327,112 to Ide et al. (hereinafter Ide), claim 12 over Takashi, APA, Cannon, TAKAHASHI, and Ide in view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2002/0101674 to Ichihara et al. (hereinafter Ichihara), claims 9, 10, 28 and 29 over APA, Cannon and TAKAHASHI in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,532 to Ikeda (hereinafter Ikeda), claim 16 over Takashi in view of Cannon, APA, TAKAHASHI and Ide and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,771,131 to Pirzadeh (hereinafter Pirzadeh), and claim 17 over Takashi, Cannon, APA, TAKAHASHI and Ide and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,932,352 to Culp (hereinafter Culp). Claims 8, 18, 19 and 27 were previously canceled.

By this amendment, Applicants' representative has amended the specification at the paragraphs beginning on page 6 at line 12, and on page 13 at line 23, amended claims 1-6, 10-17, 21-26 and 29, and canceled claims 7, 20 and 30-31. The paragraph beginning on page 6, at line 12 of the specification has been amended for consistency. Support for the amendment to the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 23 of the specification can be found, for example, in claim 20 as originally filed and in previously canceled claim 19 as originally filed. Support for the amendments to the independent claims 1, 11 and 21 can be found, for example, in the specification at page 6, lines 14-15, page 10, lines 2-3, page 11, lines 4-8, page 13, lines 10-18 and 23-25, page 13, line 31 - page 14, line 10, and also, for example, in claims 2, 7 and 19-20 as originally filed. Claims 2-6, 10, 12-17, 22-26 and 29 have been amended for consistency. As such, no new matter has been added.

With respect to the Examiner's rejections, the Examiner is invited to consider the following remarks.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-17, 20-26, and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, the specification has been amended at the paragraph beginning on page 13, at line 23 thereby obviating the rejection, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 11 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103, the presently pending independent claim 1 is representative of the independent claims and provides for a method for storing data on a magnetic tape by positioning a write head over the moving magnetic tape, providing a write current to the write head, detecting a writing error wherein the writing error is indicated by at least one of a data read back check and write head tracking information, measuring span of the writing error, disregarding the writing error when the writing error is indicated by the data read back check and the span of the writing error is less than a first threshold wherein the first threshold is based on the span of the writing error and capability of error correction information to recover mis-recorded data, suspending the write current in response to the writing error while allowing the magnetic tape to continue moving when the writing error is indicated by the write head tracking information, repositioning data that would have been stored during the span of the writing error when the span of the writing error is greater than the first threshold, repositioning the magnetic tape when the span of the writing error is greater than a second threshold wherein the second threshold is greater than the first threshold and is based on the span of the writing error and capacity of the magnetic tape, and supplying the write current to write the repositioned data when the span of the writing error is greater than at least one of the a first threshold and the second threshold and the writing error is reset.

In contrast, Cannon provides a readback system for digital recorders (Cannon, title), TAKAHASHI provides a method and device for correcting erroneous data due to thermal asperity in magnetic disc devices (TAKAHASHI, abstract), Takashi provides data recovery processing wherein the conventional overhead, primarily, latency due to rotational

recording media is removed (Takashi, abstract), and Ide provides an adjacent track position detectable information storage apparatus (Ide, title).

Nowhere do the cited references appear, alone or in combination, to disclose, teach, or suggest a method, system, or computer readable storage medium (independent claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively) for detecting a writing error wherein the writing error is indicated by at least one of a data read back check and write head tracking information, measuring span of the writing error, disregarding the writing error when the writing error is indicated by the data read back check and the span of the writing error is less than a first threshold wherein the first threshold is based on the span of the writing error and capability of error correction information to recover mis-recorded data, suspending the write current in response to the writing error while allowing the magnetic tape to continue moving when the writing error is indicated by the write head tracking information, repositioning data that would have been stored during the span of the writing error when the span of the writing error is greater than the first threshold, repositioning the magnetic tape when the span of the writing error is greater than a second threshold wherein the second threshold is greater than the first threshold and is based on the span of the writing error and capacity of the magnetic tape, and supplying the write current to write the repositioned data when the span of the writing error is greater than at least one of the a first threshold and the second threshold and the writing error is reset. Because the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to provide for all of the features of the presently pending independent claims, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims which depend from the independent claims, Applicants contend that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims are patentable. Moreover, Applicants contend these claims recite further limitations, in addition to the limitations of the independent claims, which render these claims additionally patentable.

Consequently, in view of the above and in the absence of better art, Applicants' representative respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance which

S/N: 10/044,773
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2004


Atty Dkt No. 2001-016-TAP (STK01016PUS)

allowance is respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due for the filing of this paper. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to discuss prompt resolution of any remaining issues necessary to place this case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Allen Gill, et al.

By 
Thomas W. Saur
Reg. No. 45,075
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: September 21, 2004

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351